

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

9 KHOA HOANG,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 TRIDENT SEAFOODS CORP., *et al.*,

13 Defendants.
14

Case No. C06-1158RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME FOR
DEPOSITION DISCOVERY

15
16 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for an extension of time for
17 deposition discovery. (Dkt. #39). The discovery deadline is July 8, 2007. Plaintiff seeks an
18 extension so that he may depose any person on defendant's crew lists within two months of
19 production of the crew lists, or within one month of the crewmember's return from sea if he or
20 she is currently at sea.

21 In filing this motion, plaintiff has failed to comply with a recent and explicit order of the
22 Court. In its June 11, 2007 order denying plaintiff's second motion to compel, the Court stated,

23 This is the second time that the Court has denied a discovery motion from plaintiff based
24 on a failure to meet and confer. In the future, any discovery motion must be accompanied
25 by a signed declaration from the attorney filing the motion that counsel have discussed all
of the topics in the motion by telephone or in person as required by Local Rule 37, the
specific date of the conference(s), and its outcome.

26 (Dkt. #32). Despite those clear instructions, two weeks after receiving the Court's order,
27

1 plaintiff filed this motion that contains a brief and conclusory “declaration” at the end of the
2 motion that does not certify that counsel have discussed all of the topics in the motion by
3 telephone or in person as required by Local Rule 37, the specific date of any conference, or its
4 outcome.¹

5 Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion for a discovery extension (Dkt. #39) is DENIED.

6
7 DATED this 6th day of July, 2007.

8
9 

10 Robert S. Lasnik
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 ¹ Even if plaintiff had complied with the Court’s prior order, the Court would deny the
24 motion. The crew lists contain approximately 300 names, but plaintiff has not identified a single
25 witness from that list whom he needs to depose. Also, the Court granted the parties’ stipulation
26 on June 27, 2007 to extend the discovery deadline to allow plaintiff to depose crewmembers
27 who plaintiff identified and who are currently unavailable. Plaintiff has not explained why that
seemingly extensive discovery is insufficient. Furthermore, the stipulation contains in excess of
ten deponents. Plaintiff has not shown good cause to exceed the limit contained in Federal Rule
of Civil Procedure 30(a).